## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS WESTERN DIVISION

## LAURIE BORDOCK

**PLAINTIFF** 

v.

No. 4:18-cv-917-DPM

## WAL-MART CORPORATION

**DEFENDANT** 

## **ORDER**

- **1.** Bordock's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis,*  $N_{2}$  1, is granted. She can't afford the filing fee.
- 2. The Court must screen her complaint. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). Bordock wants to sue Wal-Mart for civil rights violations. She says managers banned her from all stores for upsetting other customers. She lists the stores in Checotah and McAlester, Oklahoma, and Russellville and Dardanelle, Arkansas. Bordock says shopping in these stores was a "freakshow" experience; she was followed around, perhaps by employees, other customers, or both. She seeks \$50 million in damages.

Bordock hasn't pleaded any facts, however, which show that Wal-Mart singled her out in violation of any law. She doesn't claim, for example, that Wal-Mart acted based on Bordock's race, gender, or some other impermissible factor. And there's no civil right to a pleasant shopping experience or to shop only with the folks one finds agreeable. The Court will therefore dismiss this case without prejudice for failure to state a claim. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). If she believes the Court

has misunderstood the facts, Bordock may move to reopen, and propose an amended complaint that clarifies her claims, by 31 January 2019.

So Ordered.

D.P. Marshall Jr.

United States District Judge

sprijarshall f.

2 January 2019